



E-ASIA
university of oregon libraries

<http://e-asia.uoregon.edu>

those regions. Severe cold, the shortness of the season when good pasture is available, and the present Mongol economy, he believes, preclude the possibility of raising many sheep of improved types under present conditions; and to raise them under conditions of shelter and hand feeding he estimates would be unprofitable. Added to this there is the difficulty of controlling breeding and of organizing which would be necessary for a successful use of crossbred stock.

To no small extent, the same situation exists in Suiyuan and Ninghsia also. In addition, the disease factor must be taken into account. For those diseases for which simple effective control measures cannot be found, it must be determined to what extent the improved types are as resistant to attacks as the native breeds. These difficulties are especially true for the parts inhabited by Mongols, among whom, of course, the greater number of sheep are now raised.

Certain conditions, however, are more favorable than in the regions to which the report of Clunies Ross refers. In many parts of Suiyuan and Ninghsia, the temperature is less severe and the growing season a little longer. Among the Chinese in Suiyuan, and more so in Ninghsia, it is the habit to supplement natural pasture in the winter with by-products of the cultivated agriculture and to some extent with dried hay. In Ninghsia, there is a strong possibility that alfalfa will grow successfully on a part of the land too alkali for the production of grain crops. And the same may also be found possible in certain basins on the plateau, constituting a possibility which, if it can be developed, would do much to solve the problem of winter feeding in those localities.

Considering all factors, it must be concluded that too much may not be assumed at the beginning regarding the possibility of raising improved types of sheep in these provinces. It is probable that some places will be found suitable and some unsuitable. Experiments will be required in order to find out in what regions the improved types can be profitably raised, and the methods which must be followed in order to raise them successfully. The favorable factors in the situation, it is believed, warrant procedure with such experimentation. It is not likely that the total amount of the finer qualities of wool which may be produced in these provinces will ever become an important item in the world market; but it may perhaps be reasonably hoped that, together with the output from other provinces in North China, there can eventually be produced enough to meet the rapidly enlarging demand for this material within China itself.

KOREAN INTERFERENCE WITH CHINESE HISTORICAL RECORDS

By L. CARRINGTON GOODRICH, Ph.D.
Columbia University

Introduction.—During the last two dynasties in China Korea made repeated representations to the throne regarding the unpalatableness of certain Chinese accounts of two events in Korean history. Surprisingly enough, not one of the emperors, from the period of Yung-lo to that of T'ung-chih (1403-1874), seemed to regard their requests as presumptuous, but issued orders for the censorship of the works concerned, and at the early stages directed that these events be recorded in the Ming History in a way not to offend Korean sensibilities, and at the later stages charged the world in general to look on the accounts given in the Ming History as standard.¹

In the year 1403 the first petition was sent by the Korean king to Nanking, where the period of Yung-lo had just been ushered in after a bloody dynastic revolt. The king pointed out that the royal family tree had no connection with Yi In-in 李仁人, and asked this fact to be noted by China. The Ming emperor graciously received this information and ordered the account of the Korean coup d'état by assassination of 1391/2, as recorded in the *Tsu hsün* 祖訓, or Decrees on government of the first Ming emperor, corrected.²

¹ The author takes pleasure in acknowledging his indebtedness in the first instance to Mr. Fang Chao-ying, then a graduate student at Harvard and more recently an assistant in the Library of Congress, who pointed out the part Korea played in the 18th century in connection with the suppression of the books by Ch'en Chien and Chu Lin; and in the second instance to his colleagues at Columbia, Mr. Wang Chi-chen and Mr. Ryusaku Tsunoda, and to Mr. Ts'ui Chung-hsiu, a graduate student at Columbia, who gave assistance in bibliography and translation. Dr. Boots of the Korea Branch of the R.A.S. has supplied the romanization—which in Korea is still a moot subject—for this paper.

² See *Ta Ming hui tien* 大明會典 (preface dated Wan-li 15/2/16: March 24, 1587), 105/80a.b. For an account in English of the events which took place in Korea at the establishment of the Yi dynasty, consult William W. Rockhill, *China's intercourse with Korea from the XVth century to 1895* (1905) pp. 7-8. The name of the king is written Yi In-in 李仁任 in many books. Cf. *T'u shu chi ch'eng* 圖書集成 VIII, 24/2b, quoting the *Ming wai shih* 明外史.

Over a century later, in the year 1518, the Korean envoy, Yi Kei-maing 李繼孟, returned from Peking to Seoul and reported that the section on Korea in the *Ta Ming hui tien* (undoubtedly the one published in 1511³) carried the following statement:

"Yi In-in and his son Dan 旦 killed four kings of the Wang 王 family altogether during the years 1373—1395." This horrified the court. Two envoys were promptly despatched to Peking bearing the genealogy of the Yi dynasty, so that the Chinese overlords might know that the founder of the ruling house in Korea and his successors bore no connection with Yi In-in. They were further instructed to declare that the king's forefathers had never committed assassination, and to request that the *Ta Ming hui tien* be revised. The emperor agreed.⁴

By 1529 the Koreans were still unconvinced that the Chinese court had taken the necessary steps for revision. A supplement had been added to the *Hui tien* in the same year, but no appropriate changes had been made in the body of the text. Accordingly in the 8th moon the envoy Ryu Poo 柳溥 pressed the point again and was informed that the *Hui tien* was to be thoroughly revised. He consequently seized the opportunity to present once more the correct genealogy of the royal family and the proper account of the accession to power of the house of Yi. Ten years later (1540) two other envoys Kwon Pal 權撥 and Im Kwon 任權 made the same plea and were told: "The record left by the first [Ming] emperor will stay forever unpublished and therefore is not to be so lightheartedly discussed. It is not possible to revise the text just now. If later there is to be another supplement to the *Hui tien* we shall attach everything offered by Korea to the text."⁵

The Korean kings, however, were not lightly to be put aside. During all the years since 1529 they had been awaiting the corrected copy of the text with no results. In 1557 Cho Sa-soo 趙士秀 and in 1563 Kim Choo 金澍 again bore the now rather trite message to Peking. The editors of the *Hui tien* published a further continuation of the supplement of 1529 in 1576, but not until 1587, after at least four more appeals from Seoul, did the new text appear. In the first month of the following year (1588) a copy was presented to the Korean envoy,⁶ who delivered it to his impatient superiors in the tenth moon.

³ On the publication dates of the *Ta Ming hui tien*, see Wylie: *Notes on Chinese Literature*, reprint of 1922, 70; *Ssu k'u ch'üan shu tsung-mu* 四庫全書總目 81/4b-5a; and Pelliot: *Notes de bibliographie chinoise*, B.E.F.E.O., IX (1909), 133, n. 3. This early edition was copied into the *Ssu k'u ch'üan shu*, and also exists independently.

The copy in the National Library of Peiping shows that it was submitted to the throne in Cheng-teh 4/12/19 (January 21, 1510) and printed 6/4/10 (May 6, 1511).

⁴ Seno, Makuma 瀨野馬熊: *Chosen Shi Tai kei (Kinseishi)* 朝鮮史大系 (近世史), 99-100. This work is published by the Korean Historical Society, Seoul. In this particular account the dates according to the western calendar are often one year off. I have chosen to follow the *Ming shih* 明史 and other Chinese sources. . . . This particular incident of 1518 is recited in the anonymous "Korean History," *The Korean Review* (1902), 377.

⁵ Seno, M., *idem*.

⁶ *Ming shih* 320/14a. Seno, M., *op. cit.*, 123-5.

The pertinent passages of the revised text may be translated as follows:

According to the *Tsu hsün*, the country of Ch'ao-hsien was originally Ko-ryu 高麗. Yi In-in 李仁人 and his son Yi Sung-kei 成桂, now called Yi Dan 旦, killed four kings of the Wang 王 family during the years Hung-wu 6-28. We are still awaiting further developments. . . . In the 25th year [1392], Yi Sung-kei implored on behalf of the Wang family that the name of the kingdom be changed. The emperor agreed that it be altered to Cho-sun. . . . In the first year of Yung-lo [1403], the king of Korea memorialized that the royal family tree had no connection with Yi In-in, in order that this might be clearly understood. The account of the *coup d'état* by assassination, as recorded in the *Tsu hsün* was corrected by permission of the emperor. In the Cheng-teh—Chia-ching periods [1506-66], why should they come repeatedly to protest? Emperors gave them assurances. In Wan-li 3 [1575] their envoys made another request on the same head. It was decreed that their request be referred to the board of historiography. Now we put it down as follows: "Yi Sung-kei issued from Chun-choo 全州 of his country. His remote ancestor [Yi] Han 翰 served in Sil-la as minister of works, Sa Kong 司空. A descendant of the 13th generation [Yi] An-sa 安社 begat Haing-ri 行里. Haing-ri begat Ch'oon 椿. Ch'oon begat Ch'oon 春, who was the father of Sung-kei. As to Yi In-in, he was the descendant of Chang-kyung 長庚 who had served in the prefecture of Kyung San Poo 京山府. Now King Kong Min Wang Chun 恭愍王顯 [reigned 1352-74] of the Wang dynasty had no issue. He reared as his own child the son of his favourite Shin Ton 辛 暉 by the name of Woo 禱. Later King Kong Min Wang Chun was assassinated by his minister Hong Ryun 洪倫 and others. Yi In-in seized control and killed Hong Ryun and the rest, and put Woo [reigned 1375-88] on the throne. In the 16th year [1383], he sent an army to invade Liaotung in which [Yi] Sung-kei was second in command. While on the expedition, on arriving at the Yalu, he and other officers plotted to turn the army back. This terrified Woo; so he put on the throne his son Ch'ang 昌 [reigned 1389]. At that time the queen mother, since Ch'ang was not in favour, made the grandson Yo 瑤 king [reigned 1389-91], and killed Woo and Ch'ang and exiled [Yi] In-in. Later Yo killed innocent people, and his subjects did not want him any more and pressed [Yi] Sung-kei into taking control. This was reported in a piao 表 [a letter of congratulation and fealty] to the emperor who recognised him as king [reigned 1392-98]. The latter changed his name to Dan.⁷ Yo lived in exile the rest of his life."

II.

For eighty-eight years there was a lull in Korean petitions for the revision of Chinese records. Then, towards the end of the 15th

⁷ The details of Yi Sung-kei's ancestry are given in even greater detail in the *T'u shu chi ch'eng* VIII, 24/3b, quoting from *Ch'un Ming mêng yü lu* 春明夢餘錄, by Sun Ch'eng-tsé 孫承澤 (1592-1676) under date of 1529.

year of K'ang-hsi (15/11/chi-mao: December 5, 1676) the board of ceremonial reported the receipt of the following memorial⁸ from the King of Korea Yi 焯 (reigned 1675-1720):

Our envoy on his return to Korea bought a copy of the *Ch'ien Ming shih-liu ch'ao chi* 前明十六朝紀⁹ [Records of the sixteen reigns of the Ming] in which the affair of the year 1623, when Kwang Hai Koon 光海君 Yi Hui 璉 was dethroned and Yi Chong 倅 put in his place, was falsely recorded. Now I hear that a new decree has been promulgated for the compilation of the *Ming shih*.¹⁰ I especially send another envoy Pok Sun Koon 福善君 Yi Nam 柵 and others formally to report the whole history of this event that it may be changed and that there may be a trustworthy record.

On this the board of ceremonial remarked:

We have investigated this matter. In compiling the *Ming shih* we are only interested in right and wrong. As to the change of kings in 1623 and the real story of Yi Chong we will record them just as they occurred and will not depend on unorthodox accounts 野史. Consequently the memorial above need not be further discussed.

As to a foreign envoy coming to our capital and buying history books, it is prohibited.¹¹ Now the [Koreans] disregarded this prohibition and bought a book. We ought to send officials to Korea to meet with the king and go into the question thoroughly and punish the responsible person. The gifts brought by the envoy should be returned.

The board obtained the consent of the emperor who declared:

It is not necessary to send a high official to make the investigation. It is only necessary to order the king to apprehend those who made the purchase of historical works in violation of our regulations, have them seized and tried and appropriately punished, then to report [the fulfilment of the matter] back to me.

⁸ As given in the *Tung hua lu* 東華錄, period of K'ang-hsi, 18/11a. Cf. *Ch'ing shih kao* 清史稿, 朝鮮傳 1/5b. In general, the *Tung hua lu* gives a fuller account of each episode, and supplies the exact day of the month, whereas the "Draft history of the Ch'ing" summarizes events, and records the month only. The *K'ang-hsi shih-lu* 實錄 64/1a-2a version is identical with that given by the *Tung hua lu*. According to the author of "Korean History," *op. cit.* (1903), 515, this memorial was sent only after a sharp party fight. The king was fifteen years of age and hardly able to control his ministers. According to the *Tai Tong K'ai Nyun* 大東紀年 4/5ab, this memorial was issued in the first moon from Korea.

⁹ This book is probably the one recorded by Hsieh Kuo-chên 謝國楨 in his *Wan Ming shih chi k'ao* 晚明史籍考 (1932), 1/18ab as 皇明十六朝廣彙記 a work of 18 chüan, the first part of which was due to Ch'ên Chien 陳建 (1497-1567), and the last part—covering the incident under discussion—to an unknown hand.

¹⁰ Li Chin-hua 李晉華 points out in *明史纂修考*, *Yenching Jo. of Chinese Studies*, mon. ser., No. 3, 1-2, that in 1645 (May 26) and in 1648 (October 24) imperial edicts were issued for the compilation of the history. It was not till the edict of 1679, however, that the board of editors was really launched on its task. Cf. Wylie: *Notes*, 24; *Ch'ing shih kao*, pen chi 本紀 6/17; *Ssu k'u ch'üan shu tsung-mu* 46/7b.

¹¹ Cf. Chang Teh-ch'ang: "Maritime trade at Canton during the Ming," *Chinese Soc. and Pol. Science Review*, XVII, 2 (July 1933), 275.

Fifty years later (Yung-cheng 4/5/chi-wei: June 27, (1726) the same ministry reported a similar memorial¹² from Yi Keum 吟 (1725-76) who declared that the *Ming shih-liu ch'ao chi* wronged his ancestor Yi Chong in stating that he had come to the throne by illegal means. "I therefore request," said the Korean king, "that these incorrect statements be removed from the record and the correct substituted." The ministers saw nothing objectionable in this and recommended that after the publication of the *Ming shih*, in which the account of Yi Chong's coming to the throne would be included in the biographical section, a copy be sent to Korea. This met with the emperor's consent.

On January 6, 1739 (Ch'ien-lung 3/11/i-hai) a third petition was presented through the Ch'ing board of ceremonial, as follows:¹³

"The king of Korea Yi Keum has requested in a *piao* that he be presented a printed copy of the corrected Narrative 列傳 of his own country. On investigation we find that the succession of his ancestor Yi Chong to the throne was falsely reported. The king has already received the emperor Shih-tsung's settlement of his grievance which was conveyed in an order to the bureau of Ming historiography, commanding it to study the actual facts and revise and fix the record. A copy of the Narrative has also been made and has been given to him. The actions of his ancestor have been determined finally. Now because the volumes of the *Ming shih* are so numerous the completion of the [wood] blocks has yet to be announced. When they are reported ready, we ought to have a copy printed and presented to him. As to the gifts which have been submitted, let the emperor determine by decree whether or not they should be received, or held as part of the regular [annual] tribute."

The emperor declared: "The spirit in the request of the king that he be presented a copy of the Narrative of his native country is earnest. This Narrative has been finished. In accordance with his desires let us cut the blocks for this part first and print a copy to be given to him. In this way my wish to be gracious to strangers will be met. Let us not for the moment accept the gifts which he has sent, but hold them to form part of the regular tribute."¹⁴

Perhaps the most significant action taken by China as a result of a Korean complaint fell in 1771. Up till this time there had been a limited amount of alterations ordered in certain works. Now the destruction of whole books was countenanced. There was a new and ominous spirit at the court typified by the search throughout the empire for the works of Ch'ien Ch'ien-i 錢謙益 (1582-1664) and their wholesale burning. This began in 1769 and was to be developed

¹² *Tung hua lu*, period of Yung-cheng, 8/51ab. The *Ch'ing shih kao*, *shu kuo chuan*, 1/7a, records the date of this memorial as Yung-cheng 5/1, or January 22—February 20, 1727. This must be a slip, as the date and record in the *Yung-cheng shih-lu* 44/53a tally with the former.

¹³ In this instance I have translated the version in the *Ch'ien-lung shih-lu* 81/23b—24a, which is far more complete than the entries in *Tung hua lu*, per. of Ch'ien-lung, 8/13b, and *Ch'ing shih kao*, *shu kuo chuan*, 1/8a.

¹⁴ For a brief treatment of the tribute sent annually by Korea to China, see Rockhill, *op. cit.*, 25-26.

in the years 1774-89 into an organized and terrifying inquisition, the story of which is summarized in the author's *Literary Inquisition of Ch'ien-lung* (1935), 25-67.

On September 26, 1771 (Ch'ien-lung 36/8/ping-hsü) the board of ceremonial reported a request from Yi Keum "regarding the circulation of the *Ming chi chi lieh* 明季輯略 compiled by Chu Lin 朱璣,¹⁵ based on the *Huang Ming t'ung chi* 皇明通紀¹⁶ of Ch'en Chien of the Ming. The work in question [by Chu] records without correction the deeds of his ancestors which is a grave injustice to them. He requests that the words referring to Korea in the aforementioned two books be cut out." The board goes on to report that the records indicated that in Ch'ien-lung 22 (1757) the governor of Chekiang, Yang T'ing-chang 楊廷璋,¹⁷ proposed that Chu Lin's *Chi lieh* be destroyed by fire. As for Ch'en Chien's *T'ung chi*, "we have searched in all the bookshops of the capital and found not a single copy for sale. These two books do not seem to be circulated any longer in China. Therefore there is no need of changing or cutting out any part.

"As to the request of the present king of Korea regarding the slandering of the family tree of his royal ancestor [Yi] Dan and his ancestor of four generations back [Yi] Chong—we have looked up these two items in the *Ch'ao-hsien lieh-chuan* of the *Ming shih* and find that the table beginning with the first ancestor and the dethrone-

¹⁵ A native of Shang-yü, Chekiang, who flourished during the last decades of the 17th century. The book was published in 1696 according to the *Ch'ien-lung shih-lu* 891/6b in 15 chüan. A copy is reported by Hsieh Kuo-chen in the library of Chu T'i 朱暹 in Hai-yen, Che. (*Op. cit.*, 1/21ab and *Ch'ing k'ai kuo shih liao* 清開國史料考 3/16b.) Strangely enough, only four years later, a copy was sent up to Peking to be burned, and the emperor delivered a special edict on December 16, 1775, explaining why it need not be suppressed. No mention is made therein of the fault found with it by Korea. (See Goodrich, *op. cit.*, 138-9.)

¹⁶ A work in 24 chüan. This work was a few years later to be listed for complete destruction, but a few copies have escaped the burning. (Hsieh Kuo-chen, *Wan Ming shih chi k'ao* 1/18b and Goodrich, *ibid.*, 240.) A remarkable fact is that it was liberally used in certain sections of the *T'u shu chi ch'eng* 圖書集成 (published 1726), even in the section on Korea (cf. VIII, 23/7, 8, 18), and yet no attention was drawn to this either by the envoys from Seoul or by the emperor's own ministers. Such neglect on their part, and other evidence in the possession of the writer, seems to argue that the *T'u shu* was rarely consulted in the Ch'ien-lung period. How the four collectors (cited in C. W. Taam: *Development of Chinese Libraries under the Ch'ing dynasty* [1935], 32) to whom the emperor presented copies of the *T'u shu* in gratitude for their presentation of at least 500 rare works a-piece for transcription into the *Ssu k'u ch'ian shu*, must have chuckled when they noted this fact, even while their hearts were sad over the loss of hundreds and thousands of beautiful books.

¹⁷ A Chinese bannerman of the bordered yellow banner, who was governor of Chekiang from Ch'ien-lung 21/2 to 24/3. He died in Ch'ien-lung 36/12 (January 5—February 3, 1772) at the age of 84 sui. Yang indeed met with the emperor in 1757 on the occasion of the imperial journey to the riverine provinces (for example, on April 18; see *Ch'ien-lung shih-lu* 534/1b.), but I have not yet traced this memorial. Although the literary inquisition was not yet really launched, 1757 was a bad year for books of this sort. P'eng Chia-p'ing 彭家屏 for example,—a native of Hsia-i, Honan, who graduated as chin-shih in 1721, and who had recently retired as lieutenant-governor of Kiangsu on account of illness—was taken into custody on June 13, 1757 when he confessed to the concealment of unorthodox histories dating from the last years of the Ming 明末野史, and then was killed together with his son, when the latter foolishly set fire to the books. (See the biographies of Yang and P'eng in the *Ch'ing shih kao* 329/5a and 338/3a; also *ibid.*, 高宗本紀 12/5a.)

ment of Yi Hui and the enthronement of Yi Chong have already been thoroughly investigated and recorded clearly. In Ch'ien-lung 3 [actually January 6, 1739] your majesty granted the king's request, and sent printed copies [of the *Ming shih*] to him. Now they in turn should obediently [re-]print copies for the information of their descendants, ministers, and common people, so that they may know the truth.

"As to the two books of Ch'en Chien and Chu Lin, the *T'ung chi* and *Chi lieh*, the king should be ordered to search for them in his own country and [if found] prohibit and burn them in order to stop doubts." The report and recommendations of the board were given imperial approval.¹⁸

It would seem from the above that the court at Seoul had made its position perfectly clear, and that China had done all in its power to satisfy Korea's requests. But ninety-two years later the Koreans turned up still another 17th century historical work which repeated the same old story which they were so anxious to expunge. A further plea was necessary. The *Tung hua hsü lu* (period of T'ung-chih 21/14ab) and, in almost identical language, the *Ch'ing shih kao* (shu kuo chuan, 1/12a) report the incident as follows:

T'ung-chih 2/4/i-wei [June 5, 1863]. The Imperial Chancery and the board of ceremonial memorialized saying, "The king of Korea Yi Pyun 昇 [reigned 1850-63] has sent an envoy for the purpose of imploring China to correct certain dastardly writings, because so far not all such injustice has been removed [from Chinese books]."

The emperor declared, "The arguments of the Koreans in regard to the ancestral tree of the royal house of Korea and to the confusion of the two names Yi In-im 李仁任 and Yi In-in 李仁人 were accepted by China in our compilation of the *Ming shih*. This we in our magnanimity and sense of justice permitted throughout the empire and made known to both China and foreign countries. Now when the king of Korea saw the *Erh-shih-i shih yüeh pien* 二十一史約編 [Condensation of the Twenty-one Histories] by Cheng Yüan-ch'ing 鄭元慶 of the K'ang-hsi period¹⁹ which very slanderously recorded the family tree of the royal house, he sent an envoy to the capital to request us to correct it. His message is sincere indicating his loyalty to his line and his desire to cling to facts. Cheng Yüan-ch'ing's book, the *Yüeh pien*, in holding that the founder of the house, Yi Dan, was the son of Yi In-in 李仁人 was indeed incorrect, but the book was finished before the *Ming shih* was compiled. Scholars without erudition, due to lack of information, unavoidably repeated mistakes which were made at the beginning of the Ming. The above item is not to be relied on.

¹⁸ *Tung hua lu*, period of Ch'ien-lung 74/9b; *Ch'ing shih kao*, shu kuo chuan, 1/9b; *ch'ien-lung shih-lu* 891/6b—7b.

¹⁹ Born 1660 in Kuei-an, Chekiang; died sometime between 1730 and 1735. His *capo d'opera* is fortunately still extant, copies being reported by the Kiangsu Sinological Library (see *Catalogue* 11/6a) and by the Tientsin Municipal Library (see *Catalogue* of 1934, 1/361). According to the latter it was published in 1697. Both libraries list it as a work of 8 chüan, while the *Ch'ing shih kao*, i-wen-chih 2/11b, incorrectly calls it a work of 10 chüan.

"Now Korea has already been sent copies of the *Ming shih*. They ought to use it as the standard history and reprint it; so that their descendants, ministers, and people may know what to believe in. The above-mentioned book has long since disappeared in China; there is therefore no need of correcting it. But we will order the educational commissioners of all the provinces to inform all the schools to make known the following decree: In matters touching Korea history, the *Ming shih* shall be regarded as standard. If there are books similar to the *Yüeh pien* in circulation among the educated which contain dastardly comments about Korea nobody is to utilize them. In this way there will be only one trustworthy version [dealing with Korea]."

Conclusion.—The Korean house of Yi tried persistently to get Chinese records of two events in its dynasty history rectified. Throughout the 15th and 16th centuries it sought to bring about a revision of the section on Korea first in the *Tsu hsün* and then in the *Ta Ming hui tien* of 1511, and was finally successful in 1587. By an ironic twist which occurs so often in human affairs, it was the earlier edition which was copied into the great imperial library of Ch'ien-lung, the *Ssu k'u ch'üan shu*, which still exists in several handwritten copies. During the next three centuries, it strove to have the *Ming shih* give the "correct" version of the palace revolution of 1623, and to expunge the account from four books, the *Ming shih-liu ch'ao chi*, *Ming chi chi yüeh*, *Huang Ming t'ung chi*, and *Erh-shih-i shih yüeh pien*. The editors of the *Ming shih*, at imperial behest, did follow the requests of the Korean envoys, and both the emperors of the Ch'ien-lung and T'ung-chih periods instructed all and sundry to regard the *Ming* history as the standard authority for Korean events. Efforts were also made to do away with the four books with which they found fault, but at least one copy of each is extant to-day. Further, the *T'u shu chi ch'eng*, which was never called in question, likewise includes fairly unvarnished accounts (VIII, 24/2b-4a; 15b) of both events.

CHEKIANG HIGHWAYS¹

By ESSON M. GALE

The proof of a guide-book is to travel by it! When Mr. Carl Crow's attractive *Chekiang Highways* came into my hands, I was not able to let the short Easter holidays pass without a test of his topographical and historical researches. To be sure, I was quite certain that this veteran maker of guide-books would not go far astray, or miss what is worthwhile looking for. But on the road with the book in hand I found it something more, as well as less, than a mere "Baedeker". It is a collection of lively descriptive essays. Anything but a sinologue, as the improvised romanization of vernacular names and words indicates, Carl Crow has nevertheless the faculty of giving things Chinese a touch of humor couched in homely language—as when he speaks of Ningpo in comparison with other cities in China as a rather new place, having only appeared on the map for the first time about 500 B.C.²

Older Ningpo is, than Shanghai at least, because when Robert Fortune, that Scottish botanist who wrote so delightfully of his years of wandering in the tea countries of China, first came to Shanghai in 1843, he thought of Ningpo, though also opened by the first Anglo-Chinese treaty, as a more settled place. He was right in this for while Captain G. Butler, H. M.'s first consul at Shanghai, was only just then setting up office, Ningpo may have been used by Arab travellers in the T'ang period and certainly had a thriving Portuguese community in the mid-XVth century. These latter folk, however, are said to have behaved so badly toward the Chinese population that they were incontinently exterminated. A Mr. Flint, interpreter of the East India Company, visited Ningpo twice, as early as 1755 and 1759.

But Ningpo, like all Chinese cities, is rapidly assuming a modern complexion. Still across the one remaining pontoon-bridge a motley crowd of humanity pours day and night—reminding one of Addison's allegorical bridge of life in the prose poem "The Vision of Mirza". In this case, however, the crowd beginning apparently from nowhere,

¹ *Chekiang Highways*. By Carl Crow, Shanghai, Kelly & Walsh, Ltd., 1937.

² The French sinologue Prof. H. Maspero thoroughly explored the archaeological evidences of Chekiang in 1914, publishing the results in the *Bull. de l'Ecole Chinoise de l'Extrême Orient*, vol. XIV, 1914, under the title "Rapport Sommaire Sur Une Mission Archéologique au Tchö-kiang."